



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,485	09/02/2003	Makoto Okada	21.1886C	2320
21171	7590	12/10/2008	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			CAO, DIEM K	
SUITE 700				
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2194	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/652,485	OKADA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DIEM K. CAO	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 August 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 are pending. Applicant has amended claims 1 and canceled claim 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hao et al (U.S. 5,844,553).**

As to claim 1, Hao teaches

- storing a first set of reactions at a first computer (File 124, Application 123, Workstation 120; see Fig. 2 and associated text), and a second set of reactions at a second computer (File 134, Application 133, Workstation 130; see Fig. 2 and associated text), where each reaction in the first set comprises indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance on the first computer and execution information associated with each identified operation (a rotation motion ... rotated figured; col. 5, lines 22-29 and Applications automatically trigger their own event handlers to execute received events; col. 7, lines 1-2 and File on col. 12, lines 1-8 and 23-30), where each reaction in the second set comprises indicia of one of a plurality of operations available for performance on the second computer and execution information

associated with each identified operation (a rotation motion ... rotated figured; col. 5, lines 22-29 and Applications automatically trigger their own event handlers to execute received events; col. 7, lines 1-2 and File on col. 12, lines 1-8 and 23-30);

- at a third computer (Workstation 110; see Fig. 2 and associated text), performing one or more operations available for performance at the third computer (press a button, move a mouse, type a key, a rotate motion; col. 5, lines 16-25 and col. 8, lines 4-5);

- in response to the performance one or more operation at the third computer, generating a transmission, sent via a communication path common to the first, second and third computers, comprising indicia of the one or more performed operations and information operated on by each of the one or more operations (The rotate motion would then be captured and multicast to windows 112, 122 and 132; col. 5, lines 24-25 and col. 6, lines 59-67; col. 8, lines 4-6);

- receiving the transmission at the first and second computers via the communication path (Each application would receive the motion event; col. 5, lines 24-27);

- at the first computer, detecting the transmission received via the communication path, and determining whether the indicia included in the received transmission corresponds to at least one of the first set of reactions (Each application would receive the motion event and operate on an associated local database to determine; col. 5, lines 25-29. It is noted that at each computer, the file includes multiple events, for example, mouse click, rotate figure, etc. and their associated event handlers. Thus, in response to received event, the system needs to determine which event is received among the list of events stored in the file in order to execute the correct event handler), and if it does (since the received event is always existed in the list of events in the file), performing an execution using the execution information associated with the one of the first set

of reactions (display the rotated figure rotated figure; col. 5, lines 25-29; IEP orders them if necessary and sends the shared input events to the target application windows. Applications automatically trigger their own event handlers to execute received events; col. 6, line 65 - col. 7, line 2; and col. 9, lines 48-52 and col. 11, lines 19-21, 39-54); and

- at the second computer, determining whether the indicia included in the received transmission corresponds to at least one of the second set of reactions (Each application would receive the motion event and operate on an associated local database to determine; col. 5, lines 25-29. It is noted that at each computer, the file includes multiple events, for example, mouse click, rotate figure, etc. and their associated event handlers. Thus, in response to received event, the system needs to determine which event is received among the list of events stored in the file in order to execute the correct event handler), and if it does (since the received event is always existed in the list of events in the file), performing an execution using the execution information associated with the one of the second set of reactions (display the rotated figure rotated figure; col. 5, lines 25-29; IEP orders them if necessary and sends the shared input events to the target application windows. Applications automatically trigger their own event handlers to execute received events; col. 6, line 65 - col. 7, line 2; and col. 9, lines 48-52 and col. 11, lines 19-21, 39-54).

As to claim 2, Hao teaches

- executing original operations of different operation types (press a button, move a mouse, type a key, a rotate motion; col. 5, lines 16-25 and col. 8, lines 4-5);
- when original operations are executed, transmitting messages on a communication path,

common to a plurality of objects, whereby each message is receivable by the plurality of objects (The rotate motion would then be captured and multicast to windows 112, 122 and 132; col. 5, lines 24-25 and col. 6, lines 59-67; col. 8, lines 4-6), where the messages have a format shared by the objects, and where each message indicates the operation type of its corresponding executed operation (col. 10, lines 32-47); and

- when messages so transmitted to the plurality of objects are detected from the communication path and received, determining whether to react to each message based on each message's indicated operation type, and when determined to react to a given message, reacting by executing a reaction operation (Each application ... rotated figure; col. 5, lines 25-29 and multicast; col. 7, lines 1-2 and col. 9, lines 48-52 and col. 11, lines 19-21, 39-54. Applicant notes that examiner interprets when the computer receives the events, and in response, executes a corresponding handler, the computer/application must detect that the information/event is available) that is pre-associated with the message indicated operation type, where each object has its own set of reaction operations and pre-registered associations between its reaction operations an at least some of the operation types (a rotation motion ... rotated figured; col. 5, lines 22-29 and Applications automatically trigger their own event handlers to execute received events; col. 7, lines 1-2 and col. 11, lines 54-60 and File on col. 12, lines 1-8 and 23-30).

As to claim 3, Hao teaches the original operations comprises graphical user interface events, and wherein the operation types comprises types of graphical user interface events (press a button, move a mouse, type a key, a rotate motion; col. 5, lines 16-25 and col. 8, lines 4-5 and col. 10, lines 37-43).

As to claim 4, Hao teaches a message further indicates a parameter (certain amount) of the original operation that triggered the message (a 3-D figure to be rotated a certain amount; col. 5, lines 22-23), and wherein the reaction operation triggered by the message uses as its own parameter the parameter included with the message that determined the execution of the reaction operation (inherent from Each application ... the rotated amount; col. 5, lines 25-29).

As to claim 5, Hao teaches the communication path comprises a network chat channel (real-time collaboration window sessions, col. 7, lines 5-28).

As to claim 6, Hao teaches the plurality of objects comprises programs executing on different computer systems (Workstations 120, 130; see Fig. 2 and associated text).

As to method claim 7, it is the same as the computer product claim of claim 2 and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 8/7/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) Hao does not teach the limitations of claim 1 because Hao is directed to sharing the same action and same result based on the same action between two or more workstations, in contrast to Hao, the claimed invention is directed to

sharing the same action, but not sharing the same result based upon the same action, because each object or computer individually executes a process based on its own reaction data that defines information that should be reacted to by an object or computer (pages 5-7, regarding claim 1), namely, "each object has its own set of reaction operations and pre-registered associations between its reactions operations and at least some of the operation types (page 7, regarding claims 2 and 7).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the arguments:

- As to the point (1), Hao is directed to sharing many single-user non-modified applications between two or more workstations, and concurrent sharing of existing multiple applications with no change in a distributed environment (abstract), each object or computer has its own set of reactions to response to the received events, and each object/computer executes their own handlers/reactions. Even though the reactions of multiple objects/computers in response to an event are the same, the claim language does not distinguish that the first reaction and the second reaction are different. Therefore, the arguments are not persuasive.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO 892.
6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DIEM K. CAO whose telephone number is (571)272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

DC
December 3, 2008

Application/Control Number: 10/652,485
Art Unit: 2194

Page 9